



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,114	08/25/2008	Cordula Heidecke	2400.0440000/CMB	5283

26111 7590 01/19/2011
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, SON T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3643

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/19/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/581,114

Applicant(s)

HEIDECHE ET AL.

Examiner

Son T. Nguyen

Art Unit

3643

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/10/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only, and/or, cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of group I in the reply filed on 12/16/2010 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that ***Applicants respectfully submit that there is "a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features," as required by PCT Rule 13.2 for fulfilling the unity of invention requirement.*** This is not found persuasive because as demonstrated, the inventions are not linked as to form a single general inventive concept and are directed to multiple categories of inventions as provided in 37 CFR 1.475(b). Applicant has a product, a product and a process, which does not meet any of the categories (in addition to lacking STF as stated on page 2 of the restriction requirement) as listed on page 4 of the restriction requirement. Therefore, claims 8-10 have been withdrawn from further consideration.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Applicant's election without traverse of species B, fig. 4, in the reply filed on 12/16/2010 is acknowledged. Claims 1-7 read on the elected group I, species B, thus, will be examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3,5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE951119, on form PTO-1449, herein DE119).

For claim 1, DE119 teaches a device for treating woody plants, comprising a cylindrical injection element (see figs. 1-6) equipped with an axial bore (15); a radial slot (fig. 4, where ref. 15a is pointing at) which communicates with the above bore and whose longitudinal axis is essentially parallel to the axial bore; a fixing element (14b or 17) and an element for connecting a reservoir (16).

For claim 2, DE119 teaches the axial bore is embodied in the form of a pot bore (see figs. 1,4).

For claim 3, DE119 teaches a sealing element (18) is arranged between the fixing element and the element for connecting a reservoir.

For claim 5, DE119 teaches the fixing element is a thread (ref. 7 is a thread to fit in ref. 16).

For claim 6, DE119 teaches an element for turning and/or adjusting (21,22,23) the device is arranged behind the fixing element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE119 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mazur et al. (4908983).

DE119 is silent about a marker element, which indicates the position of the radial slot is provided behind the fixing element.

Mazur et al. teach a marker element (99), which indicates the position of a cap (98) for alignment with the marker element so as to inject specific amount of fluid from the injector. It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a marker element as taught by Mazur et al. to indicate the position of the radial slot being provided behind the fixing element in the apparatus of DE119, since known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1739, 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395, 1396 (2007).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-6889. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu from 10:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 571-272-6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Son T. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643